DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 318 317 HE 023 350

AUTHOR Andersen, Dale G.
TITLE A Model for the Annual Review of Faculty Members.
PUB DATE 89
NOTE 18p.; Tables 1-3 have small, filled type.
PUB TYPE Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Evaluation Methods; Faculty Development; *Faculty Evaluation; Faculty Promotion; Faculty Publishing; Higher Education; *Models
IDENTIFIERS *Qualitative Measures; *Quantitative Measures

ABSTRACT

A model for the systematic assessment of the performance of college faculty members developed from work at Washington State University and the University of Nevada is presented. Matrices for scoring performance, activities, and achievements in the areas of teaching, scholarly activities, and service are provided. An illustrative scoring protocol is shown which may be modified to conform to locally determined weightings for each of these three major categories of faculty performance. Also included are sample matrices and criteria for rating scales that provide both qualitative and quantitative measures for rating teaching performance, scholarly productivity, and service conributions. Contains 14 references and 4 tables. (Author/DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED318317

A Model for the

Annual Review of Faculty Members

Dale G. Andersen

University of Nevada, Las Vegas

HE 023 350

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

DALE G. ANDERSON

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ABSTRACT

A model for the systematic assessment of the performance of college faculty members is presented. Matrices for scoring performance, activities, and achievements in the areas of teaching, scholarly activities and service are provided. An illustrative scoring protocal is shown which may be modified to conform to locally determined weightings for each of these three major categories of faculty perormance.

A MODEL FOR THE ANNUAL REVIEW OF FACULTY MEMBERS

The role of the university professor is both diverse and complex. The activities pursued, the assignments laid on, and the work that actually gets done are determined by a broad array of factors. Among these are the nature of the discipline or of the field of specialization, the interests, expertise and abilities of the faculty member, the opportunities that arise, the practical demands that are associated with the mission and goals of the institution, and particularly the expectations imposed within the administrative unit in which the professor holds academic appointment. Thus the evaluation of the performance of a faculty member is most difficult. Yet in most institutions of higher education, it is required that the performance of each professor be evaluated at least once a year. Access to a systematic model for evaluating faculty performance in an accurate and fair fashion is highly desireable.

While much has been written on the evaluation of elementary and secondary teachers (Millman, 1981; Bolton, 1973; Haefele 1978; Thomas, 1979), general aspects of college reviews (Centra, 1979; Miller, 1972; Miller, 1988) and even extensive coverage of general criteria and programs (Seldin, 1980, 1984a and 1984b; Goodwin & Smith, 1981; Braskamp,

Brandenburg & Ory, 1984; and Whitman & Weiss, 1982) there has been a dearth of practical models for annual review of faculty in institutions of higher education with only one (Partin, 1984) located in the recent literature.

The present paper offers a systematic model for annual review of faculty that can be adopted to any local situation or circumstance. It grew out of work done over a decade and a half at two comprehensive state universities: Washington State University and the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. It is the product of work done by the author and several faculty committees and groups. An orderly procedure was developed to accomodate all performance tasks which are within the scope of the complex professorial role. Every conceivable performance task or achievement may be cited, credited to the faculty member and assessed as to quality.

DEFINITIONS

For purposes of clarification, the following definitions of the nomenclature used in this model are given:

CATEGORY - one of the three main areas of performance being evaluated, namely teaching, scholarly activities or service.

ACTIVITY - a subset of a CATEGORY which embraces one or more broad type of performance task or assignment.

LOADING FACTOR - the number which reflects the relative importance or value placed on the specific ACTIVITY being evaluated.

INDEX OF PERFORMANCE - the result of assessment of the interaction of quality and quantity of performance in an ACTIVITY as expressed on a five point scale (0 through 4 inclusive)

MATRICES

The matrices presented here are intended to be generic in form and function. They are mainly for purposes of illustration. Local units may define or classify activities by category differently or weight these activities differently. A key concept is that there should be a direct relationship between the weight assigned to an activity and the degree to which it is valued by the local unit.

In each of the matrices, there is an "Index of Performance" which is designed to reflect the quality and/or quality of the performance of the faculty member on each activity, based on the description protocols provided. Rating is in terms of a five point scale (0 through 4) for each of these activities. The "Loading Factor" allows the local unit to differentiate among the activities on the basis of the degree to which the activity is valued by the unit. A larger loading factor indicates a more highly valued activity.

The total possible points for an activity is calculated by simply multiplying the highest "Index of Performance" by the "Loading Factor". For example in TABLE 1 for the activity "Direct Undergraduate and/or Graduate Instruction", the maximum possible is 28 points. For the entire category of teaching the total possible points is 48.

As can be seen, the definition of teaching shown in TABLE 1 includes a variety of activities supportive of the teaching function. However direct instruction is weighted so as to receive the majority of points and thus of the bulk of recognition in this catgory in the evaluation process. Likewise teaching as a category is weighted so as to be roughty equivalent to the compositive achievements in the other two categories combined.

A similar basic format is employed in TABLE 2: Matrix for Scoring Scolarly Productivity. A general definition is given followed by an array of appropriate activities complete with the assigned loading factors. The index of performance is accompanied by a descriptive protocol for each of the points on the rating scale. The total possible points in the example given for scholarly activities is 28 with publications and/or creative achievements being most heavily weighted.

Completing the system, TABLE 3: Matrix for Scoring Service Contributions presents service-type activities both within the University and beyond. It constitutes 24 per cent of the cumulative points available in the model.

An exhaustive set of "Qualitative Evidences" and "Quantitative Measures" for each activity within each of three matrices have been developed but are too bulky to present in their entirety here. For illustration only and in the interest of brevity one selected activity of one category is presented in TABLE 4.

SUMMARY

The purpose of this report has been to present a practical yet comprehensive model for the annual evaluation of university faculty members. A set of matrices, one for each of the major categories of performance --- teaching, scholarly activities and service functions -- were displayed. The application of the system for scoring the performance of a faculty member were detailed. The system can be adapted for use by any unit of a University with relatively simple modifications.

The process of periodic evaluation of faculty is difficult and complex. The present model was developed with the intent of insuring openness and fairness in this process.

REFERENCES

Bolton, D. L. (1973) Selection and evaluation of teachers Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Braskamp, L.A., Brandenburg, D. C., and Ory, J. C. (1984). Evaluating teaching effectiveness. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Centra, J. A. (1979). Determining faculty effectiveness. San Francisco, CA: Jassey Bass Publishers.

Goodwin, H. I. & Smith, E. R. (1981). Faculty and administrator evaluation: Constructing the instruments. Morgantown, W.VA: Department of Educational Administration, College of Human Resources and Education.

Haefele, D. L. (1978). The teacher perceiver interview: How valid?", Phi Delta Kappan 59:683-684.

Miller, R. I. (1972). Evaluating faculty performance. San Francisco: Jassey-Bass Publishers.

Miller, R. I. (1988). Evaluating Faculty for Promotion and Tenure. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Miller, J. (1981). Handbook of teacher evaluation. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Partin, R. L. (1984). A case study: Evaluating faculty at Bowling Green State University. Change, 16:31 and 51-53.

Selden, P. (1980). Successful faculty evaluation programs. Crugers, NY: Coventry Press.

Seldin, P. (1984a). Changing practices in faculty evaluation

San Francisco: Jassey-Bass Publishers.

Seldin, P. (1984a) Faculty evaluation: Surveying policy and practices. Change, 16:28-33.

Thomas, M. D. (1979). Performance evaluation of educational personnel. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

Whitman, N. & Weiss, E. (1982). Faculty evaluation: The use of explicit criteria for promotion, retention and tenure (Research Report No. 2) AAHE/Higher Education.

Table 1

Matrix for Scoring Teaching Performance

Teaching: Contributions to instructional programs including assigned teaching responsibilities, student advisement and direction of thesis/dissertation work. Also includes related instructional tasks, professional growth related to teaching and supervision of staff supportive of instructional activities.

Activity	Loading Factor	Index of Performance				
		4	3	2	1	0
Undergraduate and/or Graduate Instruction and related (Total possible = 28)	x 7	Full load with ratings of "Excellent" and/or special campus wide recognition or award; significant other teaching contributions	Full load with ratings of "Commendable" or Partial load with ratings of "Excellent;" substantial other teaching contributions	Full load with ratings of "Satisfactory" or Partial load with ratings of "Commendable;" discernible other teaching contributions	Partial load with ratings of "Satisfactory;" limited other teaching contributions	"Unsatisfactory" ratings
Advisement of undergraduate, re-entry and/or graduate students (Total possible = 8)	x 2	40 or more advisees or ratings of "Excellent" with somewhat fewer advisees	30-39 advisees or ratings of "Commendable" somewhat fewer advisees	20-29 advisees or ratings of "Satisfactory" with somewhat fewer advisees	10-19 advisees; borderline ratings	Little or no advisement done
Guidance of Thesis/Dissertation Work (Total possible = 8)	x 2	Chair of 4 or more doctoral committees or active membership on 6 or more doctoral committees (or combinations); two masters committees equates to one doctoral committee)	Chair of 3 or member of 5 doctoral committees (or combinations; two masters committees equates to one doctoral committee)	Chair of 2 or member of 3-4 doctoral committees (or combinations; two masters committees equates to one doctoral committee)	Chair of 1 or member of 2 doctoral committees (or combinations; two masters committees equates to one doctoral committee)	No involvement with thesis/dissertation work
Administration or Supervision support (Total possible = 4)	x 1	Program coordinator "Excellent" rating; supervisor of several staff and/or GA's with "Excellent" ratings	Program coordinator with "Commendable" rating; supervisor of several staff/GA's with "Commendable" ratings or 2-3 staff/GA's with "Excellent" ratings	Program coordinator with "Satisfactory" rating; supervisor of several staff/GA's with "Satisfactory" ratings or 2-3 staff/GA's with "Commendable" ratings	Supervisor of 2-3 staff/GA's with "Satisfactory" rating or 1 staff/GA's with "Commendable" or "Excellent" rating	No involvement or "Unsatisfactory" rating

Table 2

Matrix for Scoring Scholarly Productivity

Scholarly Activities: Generation and/or dissemination of the results of research, creative achievements or applications or development activities. Publications, presentations and professional materials that are compatible with departmental and college mission and goals. Juried recitals or significant professional showings or exhibitions. Leadership or substantial assistance on grant projects or in securing extramural funding.

Activity	Importance Loading Factor	Quality of Performance				
		4	3	2	1	0
Publications and/or Creative Achievements	x 3	Two or more national, refereed journal articles; a book of substantial quality or equivalent	One national, refereed journal article; 3-4 book chapters; or equivalent	Three state or regional publications; 1-2 book chapters; 3-4 book reviews or equivalent	Attention to publication apparent manuscript(s) submitted; 1-2 book reviews	No evidence of of attempts to publish
Presentations or Invited Addresses	x 2	Three or more international, national or regional presentations; five or more statewide presentations	Two international, national or regional; 3-4 statewide (or combinations)	One international, national or regional; 2-3 statewide (or combinations)	One state or several local presentations	No evidence of attempts to deliver presentations
Grant Awards or Proposals	x 1	One or more major grant proposal funded or 3 or more prepared and submitted	One minor grant secured; two major or three minor grant proposals prepared and submitted. Major grant project directed successfully	Two minor or one major grant proposal prepared and submitted. Substantial assistance on a funded grant given	Progress apparant (manuscript of grant proposal submitted)	No evidence of proposal preparation
Professional Materials and/or Reports	x 1	Seminal materials published or circulated regionally or nationally; three or more field studies of note	Significant materials circulated regionally or nationally; two field studies of note	Local circulation only or restricted circulation at national/state level; one field study of note or two or more of limited impact	Some evidence of requests having been received for materials but circulation not on a systematic basis	No evidence of circulation of professional materials or reports

Table 3

Matrix for Scoring Service Contributions

Service: Delivery of unpaid consulting services to schools and agencies served by the college; participation in governance activities at university, college and department/school levels as well as outside the institution; involvements in professional associations, learned societies and honoraries.

Activity	Importance Leading Factor	4	3	2	1	0
Professional	x 1	National/state office holder or other significant recognition in a major professional organization	Strong participation at local, state, regional or national level (e.g. committee member)	Active participation (but not in a leadership role)	Membership(s)	No evidence of involvement
University Governance	x 1	Recognized leadership roles (Senate officer major university committee chair)	Two or more secondary leadership roles	Two or more routine memberships or one major university committee membership	Single membership or short term contribution	No evidence
College Involvements	x 1	Rating of "Excellent" on service contributions to COE	Rating of "Commendable" on service contributions to COE	Rating of "Satisfactory" on service contributions to COE	Little or no involvement due to extenuating circumstances such as illness or lack of opportunity	Rating of "Unsatisfactory" on college involvements
Department/ School Involvements	x 2	Rating of "Excellent" on contributions to department/ school	Rating of "Commendable" on department/school involvement	Rating of "Satisfactory" on department/school involvement	Little or no involvement due to extenuating circumstances such as illness or lack of opportunity	Rating of "Unsatisfactory" on department/ school involvements
Field Service Involvements	x 1	Major liaison role with CCSD or other professional agency; service activity leadership role; considerable unpaid inservice or Continuing Education involvement; outstanding community and public service	Significant CCSD or agency related participation; above average Continuing Education or inservice involvement. SPI site visit team. Commendable university community or public service	Discernible CCSD or agency related liaison contributions; average Continuing Education or inservice; modicum of university community and/ or public service	Some discernible involvement (perhaps paid consultant or other lesser contribution) with CCSD or agency related to UNLV service role	No evidence of field service or public service activities

Table 4

Example of Criteria for Rating Scales

CATEGORY: Teaching and Related

ACTIVITY: Assigned teaching responsibilities

Quantitative measures:

Teaching load (Number of lecture, studio or laboratory courses taught)
Numbers of student credit hours generated by instructional effort
Number of independent study, special project and/or internship course credits for which responsible

Quantitative evidence:

Evaluation of quality of performance by immediate supervisor (usually a department chair)
Normative ratings via systematic student evaluations using a standard instrument
Peer evaluations
Acknowledged leadership function in team teaching situations.
Level of quality of preparation as reflected in completeness of syllabi for courses taught
Self-assessment report of the faculty member.
Unsolicited letters of commendation or criticism.
Unsolicited informal opinions expressed by students, colleagues or observers.